



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/537,365	06/02/2005	Dieter Goldbach	05-364	2658
34704 7590 12/23/2009 BACHMAN & LAPOINTE, P.C. 900 CHAPEL STREET SUITE 1201 NEW HAVEN, CT 06510				
EXAMINER				
HSIAO, JAMES K				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3657				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/23/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/537,365

Applicant(s)

GOLDBACH ET AL.

Examiner

JAMES K. HSIAO

Art Unit

3657

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 August 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-38 and 48-51 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 39-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GS/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 39-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krupka (US-3982612) in view of Whitworth (US-1576811) and Everett (US-5896955).

Regarding claims 39, 43-45, 47, Krupka discloses a brake pad having a lining support (1) formed of a first material (col. 1, line 55) selected from a group of steel or titanium, a friction lining having a surface (2), at least one stud (7) of a second material, wherein the stud passes through a hole in the friction lining up to the lining surface (fig 2), wherein the stud abrades with the friction lining during braking (fig 2).

Krupka lacks to disclose the use of a non ferrous metal as the second material. Whitworth teaches a material of a soft brass material (20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the brake lining of Krupka with the soft brass of Whitworth because attaching the brass studs to a harder material makes a permanent and satisfactory welded joint with the steel of a lining support (col. 2, lines 81-87).

Krupa and Whitworth lack wherein the at least the one stud has a first end and an opposed second end and wherein the first end is fixed to the lining support and the second end of the stud passes through the hole and abrades simultaneously with the

friction pad. Everett teaches a brake pad wherein two different materials are simultaneously braking against a friction surface and wherein the at least the one stud (30) has a first end (30a) and an opposed second end (30c) and wherein the first end is fixed to the lining support (fig 2) and the second end of the stud passes through the hole and abrades simultaneously with the friction pad (fig 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the stud of Everett with the above combination because a pad with two different braking materials have different braking effects under different conditions (Everett abstract)

Regarding claims 40, 41, 45, 46, Krupka discloses that the studs are welded (col. 2, lines 31-43).

Regarding claims 40, 41, 45, 46, Whitworth also teaches a method for attachment of studs (40) to a lining support (14) comprising forming the studs from a soft brass material and the lining support from a harder material. (Fig 7-9) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to attach brass studs to a harder material since brass makes a permanent and satisfactory welded joint with the steel of the lining support as taught by Whitworth. (Column 2, lines 81-87)

3. Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krupka (US-3982612) in view of Whitworth (US-1576811) and Everett (US-5896955) and in further view of Hoffrichter et al. (US-6851527).

Regarding claim 42, Krupka lacks a layer in between the lining and the lining support. Hoffrichter teaches a layer in between the lining and the lining support (4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the brake pad of Krupka with layer of Hoffrichter in order to provide a damping layer in the braking pad.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 39-47 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAMES K. HSIAO whose telephone number is (571)272-6259. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Siconolfi can be reached on 571-272-7124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Bradley T King/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3657

JKH